

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending applications. The Office Action dated October 06, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claim 21, 22 and 27 are hereby amended. Claims 21-24 and 26-28 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the examined claims are respectfully requested. Claims 29 and 30 are new.

Claim Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 21 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Yoshii et al (US 2002/0030774).

Claims 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshii et al (US 2002/0030774) and further in view of Shiotsuka et al (US 6,191,353).

Claims 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshii et al (US 2002/0030774) and further in view of Matsuda et al (US 5,361,163).

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshii et al (US 2002/0030774) and further in view of Suga (US 2004/0076396).

The rejection of claims 21 and 25 as being unpatentable over Yoshii et al (US 2002/0030774) is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

First, claim 21 is allowable over Yoshii et al in that claim 1 recites a reflector that has a combination of elements, including, for example, a moisture-proof film base with thickness of 0.05 to 1mm that supports the processed resin layer. The cited references do not teach or suggest at least these limitations of the amended claim.

The examiner alleges Yoshii et al discloses a moisture-proof film base by teaching the substrate 32 (in FIG. 8). However, the substrate is made of glass or the

like. Such a glass substrate with a thickness of 0.05 to 1mm will not support the processed resin layer. Therefore, Yoshii et al does not disclose a moisture-proof film base.

Second, claim 21 recites a reflector that has a combination of elements, including, for example, "a support resin layer having a high glass transition temperature interposed between the processed resin layer and the moisture-proof film base". The cited references do not teach or suggest at least this feature of the amended claim.

The examiner admits Yoshii et al do not disclose a support resin layer but alleges it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have a support resin layer. However, the cited reference does not even have the concept of the moisture-proof of this application. The support resin layer is provided as a separate component for residual moisture which passes through the moisture-proof film. Therefore, one of ordinary skill would not just add another resin layer without knowing the concept of moisture-proof.

Third, claim 21 recites a reflector with a support resin layer, "wherein the support resin layer having a higher glass transition temperature and lower moisture absorption property than those of the processed resin layer". The cited references do not teach or suggest at least this feature of the amended claim.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 is allowable over the cited reference. Claim 22 is allowable for similar reasons as claim 21 is allowable.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 23, 24 and 26-28 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 23, 24 and 26-28 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 21 and 22, which are allowable.

New Claims

New dependant Claims 29 and 30 are added. Claim 29 is dependent on claim 21 and recites that a material of the support resin layer is polyphenylene sulfide or polyvinylidene fluoride. Claim 30 is dependent on claim 21 and further constrains the support resin layer and the moisture-proof film base. Both claim 29 and 30 are allowable

at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 21, which is allowable.
Applicants therefore respectfully request allowance of Claims 29 and 30.

In conclusion, applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments above, applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gustavo Siller, Jr./

Gustavo Siller, Jr.

Registration No. 32,305

Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P. O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
312.321.4200